



Aalborg Universitet

AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

The social capital-local community-neighbourhood configuration

Strategies for building bonding and bridging relations in neighbourhood regeneration

Arp Fallov, Mia

Publication date:
2011

Document Version
Early version, also known as pre-print

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Arp Fallov, M. (2011). *The social capital-local community-neighbourhood configuration: Strategies for building bonding and bridging relations in neighbourhood regeneration*. Institut for Sociologi, Socialt Arbejde og Organisation, Aalborg Universitet. <http://sociologi.samf.aau.dk/index.php?id=9131>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Sociologisk Arbejdspapir

Nr. 32, 2011

Mia Arp Fallov

**The social capital-local community-
neighbourhood configuration.**

Strategies for building bonding and bridging relations
in neighbourhood regeneration

Forskningsgruppen SocMap

*Institut for Sociologi og Socialt Arbejde
Aalborg Universitet
Kroghstræde 5, 9220 Aalborg Ø
Tlf. 9940 8150, fax 9811 5056
e-mail: sociologisekretariatet@socsci.aau.dk*

Mia Arp Fallov

The social capital-local community-neighbourhood configuration

Copyright © 2011 forfatteren og forskningsgruppen SocMap

ISSN: 1399-4514

ISBN:978-87-90867-35-5

Sociologiske Arbejdspapirer udgives af Institut for Sociologi og Socialt Arbejde, Aalborg Universitet.

Arbejdspapirerne omfatter mindre arbejder fx. seminar-oplæg, konference-bidrag, udkast til artikler eller kapitler.

Serien redigeres af professor Lars Skov Henriksen, professor Michael Hviid Jacobsen og professor Lisbeth B. Knudsen.

Contents

The instrumentalization of social capital in the rationality of capacity building.....	6
Rationale underpinning the building of social capital	9
Social capital and community discourses	12
Concluding discussion - two different strategies for social capital investment.....	17
Literature:.....	21

Looking at the process of popularization metaphorically, we might see that social capital acts as a kind of Greek Horse which has entered the city of Troy – the stronghold of economists, policymakers, and political scientists which have excluded sociological concerns from their thinking. From the outside, the horse itself seems to offer the attractive possibility of bringing the social, in the form of ‘social capital’ into the economists’ city: yet inside the belly of the horse, all kinds of diverse, nefarious, and unruly ‘social processes’ hide, ready to spring out (Blokland & Savage, 2008:2).

In this paper I analyse the governmental rationality that has prompted policy makers in the area of neighbourhood regeneration to allow in this Greek Horse, namely its promises of utilizing meaningful social interaction to generate resources of particular kinds as an answer to localized social exclusion. I will critically discuss the assumptions pertaining to the construed configuration between social capital, local community and neighbourhood space in the neighbourhood regeneration policies of Denmark and England. I aim to show how this configuration becomes instrumental for a common governmental rationality in the two countries of governing inclusion through capacity building. Moreover, I will discuss the implications of the, somewhat, simplistic understanding of the interaction between neighbourhood space and resident constellations of capital in the rationality of governing neighbourhood regeneration. I will argue that the mobilization of two different discourses of community result in variations in the ‘investment strategies’ in social capital (Bourdieu, 1986), and in different instrumentalization of the effects of social capital. The article is based on a comparative study of neighbourhood regeneration policies (Falloo 2006), more specifically, the implementation of the Kvarterløft programme in Vollsmose, Denmark, and the New Deal for Communities in Oldham, England. Methodologically, I have deployed a dual method of critical discourse analysis of policy documents and interviews with professionals, government officials on all levels of government, and active residents in the two neighbourhoods.¹

The concept of social capital has become somewhat of a buzz-word across a range of policy arenas, social science disciplines and across qualitative and quantitative traditions, from socioeconomics (Lin, 2000; Grannovetter, 1973; Burt, 1997) to political

¹ The documents analyzed pertain not only directly to the regeneration programmes, but to the context of urban policies and policies of social inclusion that work as framework for the regeneration policies. I have conducted a total of 30 semi-structured interviews relating to the two case areas aiming to ensure that a broad range of perspectives on the two programmes and their local implementation were represented.

science (Uslaner & Dekker, 2001; Putnam, 2000) and sociology and anthropology (Bourdieu, 1986; Coleman, 1988; Blokland & Savage, 2008). It has attracted both proponents and critiques (see, for example, Fine, 2007 and Portes, 1998 for excellent discussions). Within policies of neighbourhood regeneration the mobilization of the concept of social capital stretches across the individual and collective traditions within social sciences, although with different emphasis in Denmark and England on individual and collective resources and outcomes. Common to both is a mobilization of social capital related to the collective revitalizing of civic participation associated with Putnam (2000). This is an understanding of social capital emphasising his elements of norms, trust and networks and his influential distinction between bridging and bonding social capital. Bridging social capital refers to connections between heterogeneous groups and across social cleavages, while bonding social capital refers to inward looking links between people reinforcing homogeneity and exclusivity. At the same time, the neighbourhood regeneration policies utilize understandings of social capital which can be associated with a more individual tradition associated for example with Coleman (1988). This is visible in the emphasis on individuals being drawn in to social relations due to reciprocal obligations, which impose sanctions and normative cohesion, and that social relations generate human capital. Here there is also a connection to the Bourdieuan emphasis on social capital as a resource for social mobility – albeit without his emphasis on the asymmetrical relations of power associated with social capital investment strategies (1986).

Within these policies, then, the mobilization of the concept of social capital continues the emphasis on revitalizing social relations found in the much earlier community building and empowerment initiatives and the local environment initiatives of the 1980s. Moreover, it continues the tradition for the politicization and government of neighbour relations and friendships in socially excluded neighbourhoods (Perri 6, 2004; Crow, 2004) also within health and criminal services – albeit now in a more explicit way. I will argue that the mobilization of the concept of social capital is more than a mere question of jargon (Craig, 2007). What makes it a tool for policy makers is exactly the ambivalence of the concept making it possible to connect diverse outcomes and sometimes conflicting forms of explanation (see also Mayer, 2003). Moreover, what makes it different from earlier community building policy initiatives are the connections construed at policy level between social capital resources, neighbourhood space and community, and the assumed outcomes of this configuration both in terms of creating

individual capacities for inclusion and communal capacities for social cohesion and effective active participation in regeneration. The rest of the present paper is concerned with the analysis of these connections.

The instrumentalization of social capital in the rationality of capacity building

The argument in this paper is based on a perspective on the contemporary mode of government characterising both England and Denmark, developed in Fallov (2006), as governing through the capacities of the governed (and of the governors). This rationality of government is to govern through the modification and development of individual, communal and institutional capacities. Applying a governmentality perspective to this field, such governmental form of power can be conceptualized as the ‘conduct of conducts’ and the ‘management of possibilities’ (Foucault, 2000; Elden, 2001). It is a form of government that seeks to implant a culture of self-governance in both citizens and governors (Dean, 2003; Bang, 2004). Governing through capacity building is based on the conducting of citizens and communities in relation to what is assumed necessary capacities and legitimate norms and cultures for inclusive self-governance. It is therefore a form of governance based on the production of ‘inclusive subjects’ and communities by establishing horizons of possibilities for inclusive ways of acting and practicing self-governance.

In both countries, social exclusion policies are based on the mobilization of an individualised and spatialized understanding of social exclusion. It is individualized to the extent that focus is moved from structural causes to an emphasis on the development of capacities of employability and active citizenship, and, as we shall see below, social capital is conceived as pivotal for the development of these capacities. It is spatialized to the degree that the agency focused explanations for spatial exclusion in the area effect literature has been appropriated and inserted in social exclusion policy narratives to legitimize an area-based approach to tackling social exclusion. This results not only in focus on particular places, but also in a spatialization of the terminology of social inclusion. The strategy to govern social inclusion in both countries is a combination of risk prevention via capacity development and targeted intervention and support for ‘risk groups’ and excluded areas in the form of neighbourhood regeneration. Consequently, that targeting the most deprived areas through a triple top-down created bottom-up

strategy of developing the capacities of the area, its people, and the governance capacities in both countries is seen as an effective and just means to tackle social exclusion.² The flagship of the English National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal (hereafter NSNR) is the New Deal for Communities programme which ran in 39 neighbourhoods. In Denmark the Kvarterløft programme is the primary initiative in the recent move to area-based intervention. It has been running in 12 neighbourhoods overall, and is now in its mainstreaming phase.³

The emphasis on social capital in the English policy debate can be traced back to the Commission for Social Justice from 1994, which drew on an understanding of social capital associated with Putnam in the sense of making a close connection between social cohesion and economic effectiveness (Putnam, 2000; Levitas, 1998). Just as the notion of community in the language of New Labour is stretched to encompass both local neighbourhood and the community of the nation, social capital is a resource connected with both local communities and nation wide social cohesion and economic prosperity. At the same time, social capital is articulated as a crucial individual resource in terms of enhancing connections to the labour market, inducing ‘cultures of work’ and multiplying ‘working role models’ (Social Exclusion Unit, 2000:24). Social capital is therefore closely related to the development of other forms of capacity assumed necessary for inclusion in New Labour’s social exclusion strategy.

In the NSNR, the concept of social capital figures frequently. Social capital is understood here as the ‘contact, trust and solidarity that enables residents to help rather than fear each other’ (Social Exclusion Unit, 2000:8) and as tied to ‘community spirit’ and ‘social stability’ (Social Exclusion Unit, 2000:24). The elements of trust and networks generate reciprocity and the possibility of collective action. Therefore, social capital is mobilised as the means to generate the desired community. Lack of social

² The two countries vary in the way they govern the capacity building process and especially in the political space associated with the varying responsibilities given to local communities in the capacity building process (for a fuller discussion on the instrumentalization of communities see Fallov (2010).

³ In the English case New Deal for communities is the product of a long history of area-based initiatives. The overall strategies of the NSNR can be characterized as aiming at improving local, regional and central governance capacity, activating residents and communities to enhance their capacity for self-governance, and improving the capacity of selected neighbourhoods (Social Exclusion Unit, 2001a; 2001b). In the Danish case, intervention at the neighbourhood scale represents, on the one hand, the internationalization of policy regimes and, on the other, a particular national path where the local scale is inserted into a wider universalistic regime based on equity, and where the new local policies are negotiated to fit with already relatively autonomous local politics and strong local governments. The Kvarterløft programme, the primary initiative in a recent move to area-based intervention, aims to rebuild the capacities of deprived areas and the capacity for inclusion among their residents and, importantly, enhance the institutional capacities of governing bodies in the process (Kvarterløftssekretariatet, 2000).

capital is identified as the cause of social pathologies such as anti-social behaviour, crime, vandalism, racism, family breakdown, educational failure, and the undermining of local communities (Social Exclusion Unit, 1998:74). Thus, the role of social capital is connected to the communitarian inspired ideal of the ethical community, and the emphasis on social cohesion and behavioural explanations following from this (Taylor, 2004).⁴ The use of social capital in New Labour's language of regeneration epitomise the ideal of the active self-governing community. Social capital is seen as a resource in community capacity building and connected, therefore, to the ideal of voluntarism and 'civiness' that permeates the language of New Labour. Social capital is understood as the 'foundation that social stability and a community's ability to help itself is usually built' (Social Exclusion Unit, 2000:24). It becomes manifest in the multiple presence of 'community activities' around the existence of 'community facilities' (Social Exclusion Unit, 2000:59-60), and has, therefore, close ties to the policy image of the spatially fixed community in local neighbourhoods.

In the Danish policy arenas the concept of social capital is more recent and its increasing popularity can be seen as a result of the influence and incorporation of international policy discourses from the EU, OECD and the World Bank, as well as international academic debates. The concept does not figure as explicitly as in the English policy material, but one can trace the influence from the ideas of Putnam in the emphasis on 'ownership' and 'networks'. It can be argued that there is a Danish social capital strategy which is closely related to the neighbourhood scale and the promotion of a rich level of networks and associations that can lift marginalised neighbourhoods (Skifter Andersen & Kielgast, 2003; Andersen & Løve, 2007; Andersen, 2008). Thus, like in the English case, social capital is mainly conceptualized as a positive resource, but unlike the English debate, primarily in collective terms as there is less focus on individual social capital. The rationale of the Kvarterløft programme is that the state can help create social capital by supporting the formation of associations, and that this again will increase the levels of trust necessary for the bottom-up approach that is the ambition of the programme. In this way, the state becomes an important actor in the creation of social

⁴ However, inspired by Sarah Hale's (2006) recommendable and thought provoking analysis of New Labour's communitarianism it can be debated whether New Labour is communitarian at all? At best they have a very ambivalent stance on community (see Fallov 2010). On the one hand community is vital in New Labour's strategy for the transmission of societal values and upholding social control, but on the other hand many policies emphasise both individual duty and the importance of market generated development. Both of which undermine the development of communitarian ideas of communal responsibility.

capital, not only in relation to funding, but also in the regulation of networks and associations through the approval of agendas and regulations (Skifter Andersen & Kielgast, 2003). While the concept has had a more implicit influence at national policy level, its influence is more explicit at the local level. An example of this is the initiative “NaboSKabet” (neighbourliness) now funded by the National Organisation of Social Housing Associations. This initiative consists of the development of diagnostic tools to measure the level of social capital in particular neighbourhoods in the form a questionnaire aimed at residents in social housing associations. Here social capital is mobilized explicitly as relating both to bonding relations between neighbours in order to get by and as bridging relations and particular forms of civicness associated with participation in community associations (naboskabet.dk). Also here the rationale is that social housing associations can help create social capital at a neighbourhood wide level.

In both countries social capital becomes instrumental in tying together different dimensions of the included subject. Social capital becomes especially useful for supporting policy assumptions of the close connections between the included subject and the local community. This strategy takes divergent forms in the two countries. The Danish policy discourse is less individualised and more closely connected to state funded social mobilisation, in contrast to the English discourse where the mobilization of social capital contributes to the privatization of risk and responsibility. The concept of social capital provides policy makers with identifiable ‘handles’ to turn. It provides policies with elements that can be measured, such as the number of associations and organisations in local neighbourhoods associated with cultures of self-governance, activity and responsibility. Moreover, it provides policies with modes of explanation for policy failure conceptualised as lack of social capital. This mobilization of social capital therefore implies particular ways of seeing and conceiving excluded neighbourhoods and accompanying diagnostic modes of planning what needs to be done in order to generate social inclusion. I will now turn to a discussion of the underlying rationale.

Rationale underpinning the building of social capital

In both countries, but especially in England, there is a tendency to assume an unproblematic relation between different levels of social capital. The mobilization of social capital tends to oscillate between a conceptualization of social capital in individual terms as ‘stocks of social capital’ which facilitate access to the paths of inclusion, and neighbourhood social capital associated with the aggregate social capital of

neighbourhood networks, as well as nation wide social capital having effects on economic efficiency and social cohesion. Furthermore, there is a tendency to conflate the *sources* of social capital with the benefits of social capital as an end in itself, with the effects of social capital, and thus social capital as a *means* to achieve particular political goals. This conflation threatens to make the concept of social capital an all encompassing and meaningless term (Portes, 1998).

Firstly, since it results in a tautology in that the cause of the exclusion of particular neighbourhoods are to be located in the lack of social capital, at the same time, as the cure is assumed to be related to the development of local social capital. The particular dynamics of social capital as individual access to networked capital, as well as the complexity of the relations between different networks' resources are excluded from this view (Blokland & Savage, 2008). A particular local network of residents, for example, might benefit from the possibilities of drawing on aggregate resources, but this can not be aggregated to a neighbourhood level in any simple way. The existence of many local associations, a political goal of both regeneration strategies, cannot be assumed to be the same as high levels of neighbourhood social capital, if these associations neither link with each other creating bridging social capital (Putnam, 2000), nor are able to form collective actors linked with other neighbourhoods or government actors (Kearns, 2003).

Secondly, since the conflation of cause and effect delimit other explanations of social exclusion such as labour market structures and cultural causes related to various forms of discrimination. The mobilization of social capital as in many ways a simple and unproblematic process obscures how building social capital is enmeshed in complex relations with governing and structural processes. More specifically, how developing social capital is a question of relations of power, as some groups have more capital to invest in the social capital building process and therefore also more chance of benefitting from these processes. Therefore, the tautological relation between social capital as both cause and effect contributes to the reproduction of the asymmetrical relations in these regeneration processes, as it silences how some groups will have less capital to reinvest (Bourdieu, 1986).

Moreover, the instrumentalization of social capital in the regeneration policies is closely related to the strategy of physical renovation and a particular assumption regarding the relation between the physical and social space of the neighbourhoods. In both countries a large part of the regeneration resources are spent on physical improvements with the aim of improving the capacities of the areas as 'liveable' spaces

by renovating and demolishing unfit housing⁵, developing surrounding green areas and improving or providing community facilities (followed by events to strengthen neighbourhood identity). The technologies used to encourage the development of the physical capacities of the areas are very similar in the two countries, in spite of the differences in the composition and standards of the housing stock, and the scale of the social problems within areas of social housing. Both central governments encourage greater mix of forms of ownership, push for local authorities to have more 'flexible' allocation schemes for social housing, and emphasise the goal of mixed communities in relation to local authority planning processes (Lund, 2002; Vestergaard, 2003; Skifter Andersen, 2003).⁶ The objective of these initiatives in both countries is to improve the capacities of the area in the form of attracting the 'right' kind of residents. Or as Skifter Andersen argues, improve the capacities of the areas in such a way that makes these places suitable for citizens other than the excluded (Skifter Andersen, 2001). One of the Danish interviewees involved in the organisation of the local Kvarterløft effort expresses this succinctly:

...re-mortgaging is not only about new kitchens or the expansion of flats, it concerns the belief that by changing an area radically you can get other people to live there... It is families with a middle income who will choose a good flat in a good location...It is very clear now after a few years when you look at it [the municipality report] again...it becomes clear that this was the focus. Then you can discuss whether it is because people out here should be whiter, or that they should have a higher income, or whatever...

The belief is that by raising the standards of the area you can create new social relations and a more mixed group of residents, thereby attract a better tax base and lessen the burden on the social services. The rationale of this strategy is that success in attracting residents whom are more resourceful will endorse the area with more social and economic capital, which (hopefully) will raise the area as a whole.

The relation between the spatial regeneration strategy and the strategy of neighbourhood social capital development rests on two assumptions. Firstly, the assumption that changing places will change people and that this will result in a trickle

⁵ The difference between the two countries relates to the difference in the overall standard of the social housing stock. In Denmark the social housing stock is generally in good condition, whereas in England over two million houses owned by the local authorities did not meet the decent home standards.

⁶ However, the relative strength of the Danish social housing associations and the greater autonomy of the local authorities make it harder to impose the centrally formed goal of mixed communities in Denmark.

down effect between groups with different compositions of capital. Secondly, and relatedly, that residential proximity combined with building or improving communal fix points will encourage mixing between different social groups in the neighbourhood, which will lead to the development of bridging forms of social capital. These assumptions build on a limited understanding of the space of neighbourhoods as locations that can be filled with social capital by the mere co-presence of various compositions of social capital.

In other words, public familiarity, or knowing about others in one's neighbourhood or town by sharing the same space for daily routines, *is not* the same as and will not necessarily result in communities rich in social capital, as such familiarity is a context for but not the content of interactions and social relationships (Blokland & Savage, 2008:11).

Moreover, this strategy build on an altruistic assumption regarding the investment strategies of the middle classes, which neglect both the importance of existing capitals for reinvestments but also that groups with higher levels of social capital tend to engage in space producing strategies that reproduce their privileged position in places (Butler, 2008; Ottesen, 2009).

Social capital and community discourses

At policy level, a close connection is established between building community capacity, understood as social capital and social cohesion, and achieving social inclusion. Thus, social capital becomes more than a functional instrument; it becomes imbued with values related to the sought for local community. In this section, I will show how different discourses on community are mobilized in the two countries. I will discuss how these community discourses are closely linked to variations in the national regeneration programmes with regards to the sought outcomes of capital. Community becomes an extended terrain of government and community discourses a technique in the management of possibilities; prescriptions of legitimate relations and values in these discourses become the horizon of action for both governed and governors (Foucault, 2000; Fallov, 2010; Butler, 2002). The policy discourses are imaginaries, by which I refer to their utopian and nostalgic elements. The policy imaginaries are crucial in the sense that they influence which networks and associations are to be included in the practical monitoring of the regeneration effort, which is based on accounts of involved active

residents and networks and associations within the spatial unit of the neighbourhood. They structure the ways community becomes thinkable (and unthinkable), doable and undoable, and therefore the processes of translation between developments at the local level and procedures of monitoring by central and regional government. Furthermore, they inform the strategies for the development of projects through their prognosis of which form of social relations are perceived as generating inclusive capacities and which are deemed as incapacities.

The English strategy, with its reluctance to engage in direct state intervention, relies on community as an essential territory between the state, market and the citizen, whereas community plays a different and less pronounced role in the Danish strategies. For New Labour, community is essential in binding the individual citizen into durable legitimate relations and thus for governing the excluded and securing social cohesion. Inclusion is thought to be achieved through the rebuilding of specific values and capacities and in this process community is seen as a central medium, as well as an outcome. The consultation document preceding the New Commitment to Neighbourhood Renewal explicitly defines the circumstances in which communities ‘function best’. The following are articulated in relation to community:

[T]hey contain a broad social mix; residents have an agreed set of rules which are consistently applied; there are places and facilities where people can interact; residents are consulted and involved in how the neighbourhood is run; and there is an on-the-spot presence to tackle problems swiftly and deter crime (Social Exclusion Unit, 2000b:53).

This definition is part of the discourse of ‘rebuilding communities’ which is central to the NSNR, since the rebuilding of community and the participation of local communities in regeneration work are heralded as prerequisites for the success of the regeneration process. In this discourse there is a slippage between community and neighbourhood. Community becomes aligned with the territory of the neighbourhood and the elements of community in this definition are therefore intimately related to the capacities of neighbourhood. The assumption in this vision of community is that community relations are based on rules which are punitive of deviances (visible in the introduction of anti-social behaviour orders and community policing), formed around community facilities where people can meet. Thus, this image of community is doubly spatially fixed, through the boundaries of the neighbourhood and through the interaction at designated spatial

focal points, such as community centres and libraries. In the document from the Prime Minister's Strategy Unit the link between social exclusion and 'negative' forms of social capital is pronounced and deprived local communities are perceived as being in 'greater need for assurance and deterrents, particular to crime, disorder and antisocial behaviour'(Prime Minister's Strategy Unit, 2005:51). Conversely, 'stable' community neighbour relations, i.e. social capital, are emphasised as the source of creating social order, social control and social cohesion (Prime Minister's Strategy Unit, 2005).

This discourse on community as based on common values resonates also at the local level among local professionals and residents in the English case. For example as here expressed by one of the project officers of the NDC:

... [we were asking about] the moral values and family values and those kinds of things weren't we... the piece of work that we did on the vision and what the board members wanted at the end of this process. And it wasn't anything to do with people's wealth or things really was it, it was just a society where people have common values, they respected one another, understood one another and those kinds of things. I think that's what people see as lacking and that's what causes crime is because people don't respect one another's belongings.

Here community is based on the sharing of a common set of values that centre on the nuclear family, common understandings, world view and mutual respect. Interestingly, the example refers to the value of personal possessions, which suggests that the good of the community is individualised, and that there is respect for individual boundaries. It becomes a respect of the boundaries set by common values, rather than a respect of difference related to tolerance, or 'treating with respect the need perceived in another when acting together' (Sennett, 2003:53). It is not a respect for the other community member's status, culture or need: it is a respect for the community itself coming into being through the recognition of common values. This commonality of values is generated through the formation of strong ties of familiarity (Granovetter, 1973). These strong ties enable the community to have disciplining functions, as the manager of the NDC expresses: 'the fact that everybody knows each other stops the anonymity of bad behaviour'. Also residents refer to the same idea of the 'village community' where there is more communication and interaction between members, despite, or even because of, the experience of the fragmented and divided community. The community sought for is the close-knit network where people help each other and do things together. Thus, there is a circular argument in that a particular form of social capital is perceived to generate the

commonality of values and norms of behaviour, which is the basis of community, while community itself is seen as both container of and medium for the development of other forms of social capital.

Influenced by Nikolas Rose's discussion on Third Way and ethico-politics (2000), I coin the English discourse on community as '*community of ethics*'. It is a community of ethics because it constructs ethical subjects with abilities to self-management. It subjects its members to the behaviour prescribed by the moral code, sustained by the binding of individuals in durable relations of strong ties around the family and close networks. Among regeneration staff this discourse leans towards the moral pole with the emphasis on codes of conduct and the exclusion of transgressors, while when articulated by residents it takes on a less restrictive and more supportive ethos.

Compared to the English material, community is promoted in a less aggressive way in the Danish practice. However, the image of community that is present, albeit in a more implicit form, contains many of the same elements and is similarly spatially fixed. This is a community tied to the locality, to a 'particular neighbourhood', it is 'mixed', contains 'possibilities for a broad section of the population' and the 'integration of functions' of life and work, so the neighbourhood 'meets the needs of the citizen all through life' (By og Boligministeriet, 1999, my translation). In both countries there is an emphasis on the importance of 'neighbourhood identity' for sustaining local communities, the engaged and involved residents and the existence of facilities where these can meet. The Danish policy imaginary of community differs from the English in that community is seen as more dependent on the commonality of interest than on a moral code. This idea of 'commonality of interest' likewise implies a set of common values, but is not as strongly tied to discourses on the moral breakdown of families and local communities.

Many of the same elements of the policy imaginary of community are found at the local level in the Danish interview material. This is a community of looser ties in networks where there is a feeling of common ground, relative consensus concerning common goals, and solidarity between the different groups. Solidarity here refers to an institutionalised form of solidarity (Juul, 1997) that mirrors the discourse of welfare society, and which ties to notions of fairness and common horizons, but not in the intimate way of the job-based working class community associated with community studies (Hoggett, 1997). Rather, this is solidarity of a more abstract kind related to general support for the welfare state, thus an institutionalised solidarity related to societal discourses on equality. It is a form of solidarity that is sustained by a 'feeling of

togetherness' generated for example by community events, as explained by this local resident.

It was a big success which gathered a lot of nationalities and there was not one mean word. People dared coming here from the outside. It was funny, in this instance one could feel that *community feeling* which is here also. There was agreement about that. We should have more of this type of event, maybe not so grand, but that feeling that *things are done together*, and this will enforce the place identity which is lacking out here.

Emotions are mobilised as means to overcome the experience of the fragmented neighbourhood where each ethnic group forms strong ties inwardly. This 'feeling of togetherness' is associated with what residents refer to as having a 'social interest' in the area, or a 'social engagement' which connotes an institutionalised form of care between the different groups in the area. On this basis I have chosen to conceptualise the Danish discourse on community as one of '*community of association*', because it is a community that is built around the formation of bridging weak ties that bind the different groups together around a common cause. It is weak ties ideally formalised in the associational settings with institutionalised rules and boundaries. This Danish discourse on community reflects the Danish tradition for establishing formalised bottom-up public participation originating in the co-operative movement, community assembly houses, the so-called 'højskoler' (high schools) (Svendsen, 2009), and the established tradition for public participation in associational life.

In contrast to the 'community of associations' that dominates the local Danish discourse, where community is made public through formalised rules that constitute the various associations, the English discourse leads to a privatisation of community with emphasis on the private sphere of the family and the individual. This also implies that the Danish community of associations is based on the neighbourhood space, while the English community of ethics is based on the people supported by spatial focal points. In both countries local community social relations formed within the boundaries of the neighbourhoods are imagined as the container of capacities for inclusion and the 'reviving', 'stabilising', and development of community as a path to the development and enhancement of these capacities in their individual members. The national differences between the different relations between social capital and community emerge in relation to what effects of neighbourhood social capital are emphasised. In the English imaginary

what is emphasised is the intersection of social control, social order and cohesion with individual benefits such as access to employability through local relations. In Denmark, emphasis is likewise on the possibilities of neighbourhood networks creating social mobility and social cohesion, although more in terms of possibilities of collective action and not in the same way related to social control. The assumed connection between individual and communal social capital gains in the Danish case is, therefore, less oriented towards behavioural adaption and more towards forming the neighbourhood as a collective actor in the implementation process and as a by-product improve collective well-being.

Both residents and local professionals relate experiences of the neighbourhoods as heterogeneous, riddled with divisions and conflicts between resident groups. Such experiences point to the co-existence of counter-discourses to the policy discourses on community. The internal boundaries map onto spatial separations between forms of tenancy, generational differences, and ethnic divides. The picture that is drawn in these counter-discourses is one of communities within communities, with fluid membership, and where there are a lot of internal conflicts and rivalries. Similar experiences are also relayed in other studies of local neighbourhoods (Leonard, 2004; Blokland & Noordhoff, 2008; Cattell, 2004). Thus, social mixing across different neighbourhood groupings cannot be assumed to come about simply by producing community focal points. This also points to the gap between the policy ambition of creating a sharing of resources across networks and the experiences of rooted conflicts between different groups. Other studies have also highlighted that local community networks understood as neighbour relations can result in production of 'negative social capital' in the form of the containment of excluded residents by processes of peer pressure, fear of the unknown, stigma and draining effects of neighbour help (Curley, 2008; Blokland & Noordhoff, 2008).

Concluding discussion - two different strategies for social capital investment

I have shown above how the interaction between the mobilization of social capital and the spatial regeneration strategies rests on specific assumptions relating to local communities. Moreover, that this configuration between social capital, neighbourhood space and local communities assumed necessary for generating social inclusion is imbued with different values in the two national regeneration programmes. Two different national practices

emerge in regard to how the relation between investment in the production of space and the building of local community is thought to contribute to local inclusion. In Denmark, public investment in space production through the renovation of housing and building of local community centres, combined with investment in symbolic identification strategies are thought to achieve bridging relations between different intra-neighbourhood networks in the form of relations between formalised associations. Social capital is thus articulated mainly in collective terms and supported by the community imaginary relating to the 'community of association'. These bridging relations are then assumed to have positive effects on the excluded neighbourhoods inclusive capacities in the form of producing an effective and innovative institutional environment in which regeneration policies can be implemented. It is effective in terms of relying on the voice of the formalised bridging neighbourhood relations for legitimacy and innovative since these relations provide the institutional settings with autonomy to engage in innovative strategies and methods. At the same time, an added value is that besides providing residents with social networks that can assist resident groups in getting by, the 'community of association' is to facilitate the spreading and acquirement of capacities thought necessary to 'get on', especially democratic capacities associated with particular forms of civiness.

The English 'community of ethics' is a different strategy in that more public emphasis, and not necessarily public economic capital, is placed on forming value based bonding social networks. Here territoriality is instrumental more as a symbolic support rather than as a formative base. This is not to claim that the English strategy is any less a top-down created bottom-up strategy (see Fallov, 2006). 'Community of ethics' is precisely not autonomous communities, but tied into a whole set of embedded institutional settings that work to set the moral guidelines within which the community can engage in ethical practices. Effective coping and local inclusion emerge on the background of the alignment of local social cohesion with a national vision of the cohesive society. In terms of individual inclusion strategies, 'community of ethics' provide residents with bonding social networks and these are assumed to develop into bridging relations providing individual residents with capacities of employability and the norms associated with active citizenship.

Following Bærenholdt and Aarsæther (2002) it can be proposed that the national strategies approach social capital investment from opposite sides of the embeddedness-autonomy relation (Woolcock 1998). The two regeneration policies use many of the same space- and community producing technologies, but these are then set in different contexts

depending on how they approach the balance between embeddedness and autonomy. Therefore, the emphasis on the sources and effects of the social networks in which the included subject is inscribed take slightly different forms in the two national regeneration programmes. To put it crudely, the Danish regeneration strategies relies on building bridging and linking social capital relations, while the English strategy relies on the transition from bonding to bridging and linking social capital. The two countries deploy the same rationality of capacity building and development of social capital in the government of social inclusion, but the practice regimes in which this rationality becomes ingrained move the national inclusion strategies in two different directions.

Table 1: Summarising social capital and community discourses

	Denmark	England
Social capital	Collective	Individual to collective
Form of ties	Bridging and linking to Bonding	Bonding to bridging and linking
Community discourse	‘Community of association’	‘Ethical community’
Social capital investment strategy	Primarily public investment in local spaces and community infrastructure to achieve trickle down effect. Territoriality is formative base of bridging and linking ties.	Mix of public, private and third sector investment in local spaces and community infrastructures to achieve trickle down effect. Territoriality as symbolic support for bonding ties.
Embeddedness/autonomy balance	Embeddedness lead to legitimate, autonomous and innovative self-governance.	Autonomy and innovation of governance actors secured and controlled by value embeddedness.
Perceived effects of social capital	Active participation and effective regeneration. Bridging ties lead to the formation of democratic capacities, social mobility and everyday coping.	Transmission of values to secure effective regeneration and legitimate practices of active participation/social control and cohesion. Combined with trickle down effect lead to bridging ties and the formation of the capacities of employability.

The message promoted here is to underline the complexities of building social capital as a route to social inclusion. Firstly, I have shown the implications of implementing a definition of social capital that makes conceptual leaps between sources and consequences. I have argued how the rationale of mixing between different groups will lead to the transmission of social capital neglects how, particularly, the middle classes engage in spatial practices that aim to secure their own social capital investments.

Furthermore, that building local social capital cannot be based on the aggregate amount of bridging relations without investigating the quality of these relations, in terms of whether they actually do permit access to resources. Taking out all the interim calculations involved in the continuum of how social capital actually works, when in interplay with cultural and spatial factors, makes it even more difficult for marginalised groups to access the arenas of legitimate social capital building. Secondly, to focus on the complexities in the social capital, local community, neighbourhood configuration is not to dismiss that the emphasis on social capital in regeneration policies signifies a positive attention to the importance of the social fabric of excluded neighbourhoods for generating social inclusion and effective regeneration. Rather, it is expose the unfortunate interconnections between the different assumptions underlying the rationality of the government of spatial exclusion which pose barriers for a more innovative and creative way of promoting inclusion, thus; a more inclusive inclusion policy.

Literature:

- Andersen, John, Flemming von hadeln, Løve (2007): "Social kapital og empowerment processer i lokalsamfund", in Poul Hegedahl, Sarah Rosenmeier (eds.): *Social kapital som teori og praksis*. København: Forlaget Samfundslitteratur:67-111.
- Andersen, John (2008): *Ressourcemobiliserende beskæftigelsespolitik - strategier og erfaringer fra udsatte byområder*. Roskilde: Roskilde Universitetsforlag.
- Bang, Henrik P. (2004): "Culture Governance: Governing Self-Reflexive Modernity". *Public Administration*, 82(1):157-190.
- Blokland, Tanja, Floris Noordhoff (2008): "The Weakness of Weak Ties: Social Capital to Get Ahead Among the Urban Poor in Rotterdam and Amsterdam", in Tanja Blokland & Mike Savage (eds.): *Networked Urbanism - Social Capital in the City*. Aldershot: Ashgate:105-125.
- Blokland, Tanja, Mike Savage (2008): "Social Capital and Networked Urbanism", in Tanja Blokland, Mike Savage (eds.): *Networked Urbanism - Social Capital in the City*. Aldershot: Ashgate:1-20.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1986): "The Forms of Capital", in John G. Richardson (ed.): *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. Westport: Greenwood Press: 241-258.
- Burt, Ronald S. (1997): "The Contingent Value of Social Capital". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(2):339-365.
- Butler, Judith (2002): "What is critique?", in David Ingram (ed.): *The Political*. Oxford: Oxford University Press:212-228.
- Butler, Tim (2008): "Social Capital and the Formation of London's Middle Classes", in Tanja Blokland & Mike Savage (eds.): *Networked Urbanism - Social Capital in the City*. Aldershot: Ashgate: 217-236.
- By og Boligministeriet (1999): *Fremtidens by*. Copenhagen: By og Boligministeriet.
- Bærenholdt, Jørgen Ole, Nils Aarsæther (2002): "Coping Strategies, Social Capital and Space". *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 9(2):151-165.
- Cattell, Vicky (2004): "Having a Laugh and Mucking in Together: Using Social Capital to Explore Dynamics Between Structure and Agency in the Context of Declining and Regenerated Neighbourhoods". *Sociology*, 38(5):945-963.
- Coleman, James S. (1988): "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital". *The American Journal of Sociology*, 94, Supplement: Organizations and Institutions: Sociological and Economic Approaches to the Analysis of Social Structure:95-120.
- Craig, Gary (2007): "Community capacity-building: Something old, something new...?" *Critical Social Policy*, 27(3):335-359.
- Crow, Graham (2004): "Social Networks and Social Exclusion: An Overview of the Debate", in Chris, Philipson, Allan, Graham & David Morgan (eds.): *Social Networks and Social Exclusion - Sociological and Policy Perspectives*. Aldershot: Ashgate:7-20.
- Curley, Alexandra M. (2008): "A New Place, a New Network? Social Capital Effects of Residential Relocation for Poor Women", in Tanja Blokland & Mike Savage (eds.): *Networked Urbanism - Social Capital in the City*. Aldershot: Ashgate: 85-104.
- Dean, Mitchell (2003): "Culture governance and individualisation", in Henrik Bang (ed.): *Governance as social and political communication*. Manchester: Manchester University Press: 117-139.
- Elden, Stuart (2001): *Mapping the Present - Heidegger, Foucault and the Project of Spatial History*. London: Continuum.

- Fallov, Mia Arp (2006): *Speaking the Language of Capacity: Neighbourhood Regeneration and Social Exclusion in Denmark and England*, PhD thesis, Department of Sociology, Lancaster: Lancaster University.
- Fallov, Mia Arp (2010): "Community capacity building as the route to inclusion in neighbourhood regeneration?" *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 34(4):789–804.
- Fine, Ben (2007): "Social capital". *Development in Practice*, 17(4-5):566-574.
- Foucault, Michell (2000): "The Subject and Power", in James D. Faubion (ed.): *Power - Essential works of Foucault 1954-1984 Vol. 3*. London: Penguin.
- Granovetter, Mark (1973): "The strength of weak ties". *American Journal of Sociology*, 78: 1360-1380.
- Hale, Sarah (2006): *Blair's community - Communitarian thought and New Labour*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Hoggett, Paul (1997): "Contested communities", in Paul Hoggett (ed.): *Contested Communities - Experiences, struggles, policies*. Bristol: Policy Press:3-16.
- Juul, Søren (1997): "Solidaritet og integration i det moderne samfund." *Dansk Sociologi*, 8(1):39-60.
- Kearns, Ade (2003): "Social capital, regeneration and urban policy", in Rob Imrie, Mike Raco (eds.): *Urban Renaissance*. Bristol: Policy Press:37-61.
- Kvarterløftssekretariatet (2000): *Kravspecifikation for kvarterløft*. København: Statens sekretariat for kvarterløft.
- Leonard, Madeleine (2004): "Bonding and Bridging Social Capital: Reflections from Belfast". *Sociology*, 38(5):927-944.
- Levitas, Ruth (1998): *The Inclusive Society? Social Exclusion and New Labour*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Lin, Nan (2000): "Inequality in Social Capital". *Contemporary Sociology*, 29(6):785-795.
- Lund, Brian (2002): "Safe as Houses? Housing Policy under New Labour", in Martin Powell (ed.): *Evaluating New Labour's Welfare Reforms*. Bristol: Policy Press:107-126.
- Mayer, Margit (2003): "The Onward Sweep of Social Capital: Causes and Consequences for Understanding Cities, Communities and urban Movements". *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(1):110-32.
- Ottesen, Mai Hede (2009): "A Sense of One's Place. Residentiale erfaringer i arbejder- og overklassen." *Sociologisk Tidsskrift*, 1:41-67.
- Perri 6 (2004): "Can Government Influence our Friendships? The Range and limits of Tools for Trying to Shape Solidarities", in Chris, Philipson, Allan, Graham & David Morgan (eds.): *Social Networks and Social Exclusion - Sociological and Policy Perspectives*. Aldershot: Ashgate:180-204.
- Portes, Alejandro (1998): "Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology". *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24:1-24.
- Prime Minister's Strategy Unit (2005): *Improving the prospects of people living in areas of multiple deprivation in England*. London: Cabinet Office & ODP.
- Putnam, Robert D. (2000): *Bowling Alone - The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. London: Simon & Schuster.
- Rose, Nikolas (2000): "Community, Citizenship and the Third Way". *American Behavioural Scientist*, 43(9):1395-1411.
- Sennett, Richard (2003): *Respect - The Formation of Character in an age of Inequality*. London: Penguin Press.
- Skifter Andersen, Hans (2003): *Urban Sores - On the interaction between segregation urban decay and deprived neighbourhoods*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

- Skifter Andersen, Hans (2001): "What is the Special Purpose of Area Based Initiatives? How to Understand Deprived Urban Neighbourhoods", Paper presented at the Danish Building and Urban Research/EURA Conference: *Area-based initiatives in contemporary urban policy – innovations in city governance*, Copenhagen, 17-19th May.
- Skifter Andersen, Hans, Louise, Kielgast (2003): *De syv første kvarterløft*. Hørsholm: By og Byg.
- Social Exclusion Unit (1998): *Bringing Britain Together: a National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal*. London: HMSO.
- Social Exclusion Unit (2000): *National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal: a framework for consultation*. London: Cabinet Office.
- Social Exclusion Unit (2001a): *A New Commitment to Neighbourhood Renewal - National Strategy Action Plan*. London: Cabinet Office.
- Social Exclusion Unit (2001b): *Preventing Social Exclusion*. London: Cabinet Office.
- Svendsen, Gunnar Lind Haase (2009): "Socio-spatial planning in the creation of bridging social capital: The importance of multifunctional centres for intergroup networks and integration", Paper presented at the CINEFOGO conference *The Social Differentiation of Trust and Social Capital*, 8-9th June 2009, Aalborg, Denmark.
- Taylor, Marilyn (2004): "Community Issues and Social Networks", in Chris, Philipson, Allan, Graham & David Morgan (eds.): *Social Networks and Social Exclusion - Sociological and Policy Perspectives*. Aldershot: Ashgate:205-218.
- Uslaner, Eric M., Paul Dekker (2001): "The 'social' in social capital", in Eric M. Uslaner, Paul Dekker (eds.): *Social Capital and Participation in Everyday Life*. London: Routledge:176-187.
- Vestergaard, Hedvig (2003): "Almene boliger i Danmark", in Nordisk Ministerråd *Allmännyttiga och sociala bostäders framtid i Norden*. København, Nordisk Ministerråd.
- Woolcock, Michael (1998): "Social Capital and Economic Development: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis and Policy Framework." *Theory and Society*, 27(2):151-208.